
DAVE DEXTER

Listed below are my initial comments and questions regarding the June 3 draft Transportation Management Plan.

1. The plan does not discuss the provision in the FY 2011 House Armed Services Authorization bill that puts a temporary restriction on parking for BRAC-133 employees at 1,000 spaces. Is a contingency plan being prepared to address this limitation on parking?
2. The plan indicates the site can be accessed via the intersection of Beauregard and Mark Center Drive and the intersection of Seminary Road and Mark Center Drive. In fact, the site generally can be accessed only via the intersection of Beauregard and Mark Center Drive. All vehicles coming from northbound and southbound I-395 will be required to use the Beauregard/Mark Center Drive access point.
3. The plan indicates that there will be only five bays at the Transportation Center to accommodate DoD shuttles, as well as Dash, Metro, and privately operated buses. The number of bays should be expanded to reduce the likelihood of service delays and traffic spillback.
4. The traffic impact analysis section of the plan cites several studies that have been conducted between 2003 and the present. Unfortunately, there is no solid comparative analysis of the studies nor is there any attempt to reconcile the major differences that exist between them.
5. In the recommended intersection improvements section of the plan, there are problems with the three improvements related to Foster Avenue:
 - a. ³Widen Beauregard to receive four lanes of traffic at Foster Ave.² Foster Avenue does not connect to Beauregard.
 - b. ³Widen and improve Foster Ave. to receive two lanes of one-way traffic and provide a merge to Seminary Road.² Foster Avenue runs parallel to Seminary Road and therefore a merge is not possible.
 - c. ³Widen Seminary Road at the Foster Ave. merge location.² Again, Foster Avenue runs parallel to Seminary Road and a merge is not possible
6. In the traffic impact analysis section of the plan, reference is made to the ongoing VDOT study to develop alternatives for providing direct HOV

access to the site from I-395. The plan should clearly indicate that it will take multiple years to fund, design, and construct such an access.

7. The plan states that ³the BRAC-133 TMP will consider the Travel Demand Management Plan strategies (promoted by the City) detailed in the existing Mark Center Plaza 1A and 1B TMP (developed March 31, 2003) and meet or exceed the outcome of the strategies.² One key feature in the City's Mark Center Plaza TMP is the requirement to charge market rates for parking at the site. The community strongly advocated for this requirement in order to reduce the volume of single-occupant vehicles and the requirement is an integral part of the Special Use Permit for the site. The BRAC-133 TMP needs to address this issue.

8. The plan's discussion of the BRAC-133 Employee Orientation Handbook should highlight the fact that there will be restricted parking at the Southern Towers complex and in all of the nearby residential neighborhoods.

9. The plan indicates that the BRAC-133 office complex is LEED Gold certified. Has this certification been issued, and is it for both the office towers and the parking facilities?

DICK SOMERS

I am in essential agreement with Dave Dexter's comments of June 9th. I do have a limited number of additional observations which should be considered in development of the final TMP.

First, with respect to Dave's comment regarding the temporary restriction to 1000 parking spaces addressed in the House version of the Defense Authorization Bill, a TMP approach addressing that possibility is essential, even if the provision is not incorporated in the final Authorization Bill. This would require TMP identification/provision of alternative transportation for an additional 2,430 no-drive and park commuters beyond the 2,970 asserted to be provided for in the Executive Summary of the current TMP draft. It must be recognized that traffic at critical intersections near the site is already bordering on failing service levels during rush hours and that much of this has occurred since earlier traffic studies cited in the draft TMP were prepared. There are no totally effective short-term solutions to these problems and it will be several years (as Dave points out) before major changes such as direct site access from 395 can be approved, funded, and completed.

Second, the Plan needs to consider, to the extent it has not already done so, the rush-hour impact of proposed vanpool and bus (and rail to bus) transit essential to accommodate those commuters that will not drive, slug, walk, or bike.

Third, to the extent the final Plan may consider recommending widening of any streets in the vicinity (beyond the essential "triple-turn" project now under way), it must be recognized that this too will not provide a solution or solutions that can be implemented before the facility opens.

Finally, when the plan is delivered in its final approved form, time to implement its recommendations and the impact of delays must be carefully weighed. Accordingly the final version should address the full set of recommend actions, identify steps DoD must take to implement, and provide a critical timeline for implementation of each essential plan component.

JULIE EDELSON

I agree with Dave Dexter's comments with the following additions; In reviewing how the available 3747 parking spaces will be allocated, it appears there are 3003 spaces available for SOV that are not otherwise dedicated to a specific type of driver (Set aside spaces for government vehicles – 150, ADA/accessible – 48, vanpool -320, alternate fuel – 192, buffer -34) or, at the most 3243 spaces adding back ADA and alternate fuel spaces. The report states that 3430 “employees” will have parking spots (SOV only?). On page 95 it stated 57% of employees will be provided spaces (?). I did not see any comment about setting aside visitor spaces though understand that consultants will visit the site. I would strongly recommend more clearly elaborating on the number of true SOV spaces available for employee allocation as there seems to be some discrepancy. Page 22 states that the area is served by an “extensive road system” but failed to mention that it presently provides poor service to the immediate residents during peak hours.

The proposal to shift or add a stop for existing bus routes at the Mark Center would likely add time to the route. I would like the report to make a comment about projected trip duration impacts so that local residents are fully aware of a potential impact in their commute.

The report provided optional bike paths of which two are unfeasible. E-1 (Lacy Route from Columbia Pike) has a steep hill and goes through Fairfax/City of Alexandria neighborhoods without sidewalks/dedicated bike lanes of which are presently used as cut-through vehicle routes. E-1 illustrates the most roundabout way I have seen to go from Glen Hills Park to the Mark Center properties. N. Beauregard St. is the most likely northbound route from N. Morgan St. until the Holmes Crossing is completed. Realize, as well, that during the school year, the combination of bikers and elementary school children on the same sidewalks/sides of roads could be dangerous. There are approximately 1400 elementary children who attend Ramsey and John Adams Elementary Schools.

The evaluation reports should report on the percentage of occupancy in the building if there is a phase in process, depending on the passing of the FY 2011 House Armed Services Authorization bill with Moran's parking space stipulation.

Eluded to, but not clearly stated, is likelihood that the north and south

I-395 exists on either side of Seminary Rd (King St and Duke St/Little River Turnpike) will also be impacted by non shuttle traffic trying to avoid the more congested Seminary intersection. Is there any way to evaluate how these intersections are impacted by BRAC-133 in the designated reporting intervals?

I also agree with Dave Cavanaugh that DoD shuttle service from satellite parking areas should also serve as an interim alternative. Could Landmark Mall as currently occupied, be an option for SOV parking? If so, a clear route from northbound I-395 into the Mall parking will need to be designated to go to the Van Dorn entrance. Vehicles presently get off the northbound interstate exit and cut into the dedicated left lane ramp entrance which is unsafe and not allowed.

MARK BENEDICT

Mark (Parkside) concurs with Dave Dexter's comments and concerns.

DAVE CAVANAUGH

Enclosed are comments on the public review draft of the Transportation Management Plan for BRAC-133 at Mark Center. In general the plan is superficial and does not adequately explore all of the options for safely and efficiently moving Department of Defense employees and contractors into the Washington Headquarters Services (WHS) BRAC 133 Office Complex at Mark Center by September 2011. The plan follows a generally accepted format but fails to address a variety of issues specific to this site. In addition, it provides no assurance to the City of Alexandria that the modest goals of “striving for a 40 percent reduction of SOV (Single Occupancy Vehicle) to the BRAC-133 site will be met.

The plan:

1. Fails to adequately consider the impact of BRAC-133 on the regional and local transportation network and provide realistic solutions that can be implemented in the near and intermediate time periods.
2. Fails to address the full transportation impacts of 6409 employees occupying the building in September 2011. Some of these impacts not only have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of people living in the area, but also result in taxpayers of Alexandria absorbing costs associated with street and road improvements, increased transit service, fire and emergency medical services, and costs associated with DoD shuttle service at metro stations.
3. Fails to consider DoD shuttle service from satellite parking areas as an interim alternative.

It would be a disservice to the Alexandria community and to DoD employees to move ahead knowing the traffic mess that will be created. DoD and the City of Alexandria need to find a way to get employees to the office complex without significantly adding to the projected traffic gridlock. Hopefully the Transportation Management Plan will be revised to more realistically mitigate repeated concerns raised by the community.

Sincerely,
Dave Cavanaugh

Modest Goals-Faulty Analysis-Empty Promises

TMP Goals are too modest.

The goals of the TMP are twofold:

1. To reduce peak hour travel by striving for a 40 percent reduction of SOV trips to the BRAC 133 site in order to minimize traffic impacts on the neighboring community.
2. To facilitate tenant mobility to the site by providing a viable transportation program in order to help employees choose appropriate commute methods for getting to Mark Center.

More emphasis needs to be placed on ensuring systems and infrastructure is in place to make transit more attractive increase use. WHS-BRAC 133 will become a major regional transportation center for DoD employees in the I-395 corridor and employees transferring to other DoD facilities (Pentagon). Currently transit is not an attractive option and the influx of employees will make it even less appealing. The TMP should aggressively provide transit infrastructure to accommodate their employees and making transit a viable option.

Buses, van pools, shuttles, bikes, pedestrians are all caught in AM/PM peak traffic congested road network. The TMP fails to provide a plan to addressing the overriding issue; traffic congestion related to WHS-BRAC 133.

Road Improvements to accommodate employees are insufficient

There have been a variety of studies completed since 2003. The studies are often different in scope and rely on different assumptions. Consequently, they arrive at different conclusions. However, it is generally agreed the proposed off site road improvements currently under construction will not adequately handle the additional site generated traffic and several intersections would operate at unacceptable levels.

Other options for realigning the interchange or providing direct access to the WHS-BRAC Complex at Mark Center are dependent on approval of design, funding and any solution is far into the future.

4.5.2 Employee Concerns identifies many of the same concerns raised by residents.

As outlined on page 94, most of the roadway improvement including the Seminary Road exit ramps from I-395 north and south will continue to operate at unacceptable levels, High Occupancy Vehicle access to Seminary Road from I-395 and other short and long term improvements are being studied and funding for any of the projects is uncertain.

The delay in construction and funding for road and transit improvements should be taken into consideration in the Transportation Management Plan.

DoD Transit Planning is limited

The additional employees possibly using public transit will strain existing capacity, adversely impacting current service for Alexandria residents, with no additional reimbursement to the City or WMATA for increased public transit service.

The other modes of transportation, van pools, shuttles, car pools are not incorporated into an overall system plan and will only add to the traffic congestion on roads and streets currently and projected to be operating at unacceptable levels of service.

The plan and analysis totally ignores the Franconia-Springfield Railway Express station and availability of parking for employees travelling along the I-395 corridor. This option should be considered, just as options for shuttle service from the Pentagon Transit Center, King Street Metro Station, Ballston, East Falls and West Falls Church Metrorail Stations Metro and VRE stations were considered in the TMP.

DoD shuttle buses for employees are proposed to be operating at 10 or 15 minute headways to and from Metro Stations during the AM/PM peak periods. The TMP should consider impacts on traffic near and in the metro station bus terminal area to ensure the shuttle buses are not adding to congestion and that employees can reasonably expect on time service. There is no reference in the TMP that sufficient coordination has occurred with affected jurisdictions.

Parking

Parking is restricted to 3,747 spaces.

The TMP also fails to analyze impacts of providing free parking to employees and contractors at the WHS-BRAC Office Complex-Mark Center. Since employees are being consolidated from private leased space where they paid for parking, and since this facility is in a urban area, employees should be charged market rate for parking. This would provide additional incentives for building and providing better transit options.

The Special Events Protocol requiring visitors attending a conference, training seminar, organized large meeting or other special events to board a DoD shuttle bus from designated Metrorail pick-up points will be difficult to implement.

It is likely meetings and conferences will generate additional traffic and demand for parking in nearby neighborhoods.

The Transportation Center is not be designed to accommodate increased DoD transit use in 2011 or the near future.

A recent I-95/I-395 Transit/Transportation Demand Management Study, April 2010 concludes: "The future Seminary Road/Mark Center Transit Center is projected to attract heavy ridership, both as an origin/destination and as a transfer point to the Pentagon". The report recommends a need for two additional BRT Bays, in addition to local and express bays.

1.1.7 Memorandum: Mark Center Transit Center, Wells and Associates, April 2009 projects the Mark Center Transportation Center could potentially be served by 69 buses including public transit vehicles and DoD shuttles during the AM and PM peak hours.

The large number of buses and shuttles will potentially lead to back-up and delays in service and contribute to a significant number of trips to and from the WHS-BRAC-133 Transportation Center at Mark Center.

Consequently, DoD should re-evaluate the size of the transit center to accommodate the large number of buses and shuttles for DoD and contractor employees living in the I-395 corridor.

Slugging

The plan fails to identify where on the site safe queuing for “slugging” can occur.

Transportation Management Plan

There is no reason the City of Alexandria or the local community can rely on trusting the DoD leadership to address concerns outside the area of the WHS-BRAC at Mark Center.

The program is essentially voluntary.

(“A monitoring and effectiveness plan will help the Transportation Coordinator to evaluate the effectiveness of the various transportation programs and strategies under the BRAC-133”, ES-4)

Without active *engagement* by the City of Alexandria and improved flexibility and cooperation by DoD officials, there is no assurance to the community or the City of Alexandria that “Senior Army and DoD leadership will maintain situational awareness of the effectiveness of the TMP and will operationally support ongoing efforts to achieve the goals of the TMP (p.121).”

Bicycles and Employees Walking to Work

Bicycle paths do not service the WHS-BRAC-133 Office Complex. They are nearly a mile away and the hilly terrain north and south on Beauregard, as well as the roadway congestion, makes bicycling a very unsafe, and unattractive option.

Contrary to the statement made on page 117, it is highly unlikely that many of the employees would walk to the site.

With the exception of apartments at Southern Towers, it is unlikely there are many employees living within a twenty minute walk of WHS-BRAC0-133 at Mark Center.

The Transportation Management Plan states:

“Over 500 employees live within three miles of BRAC 133, over 400 employees within two miles and over 100 employees in less than one mile.”

It is highly unlikely that many would walk to the site because of:

1. Few residents live within walking distance of the complex,

2. Streets in the nearby neighborhoods are not on a normal street grid pattern, requiring pedestrians to take a more the circuitous route to the complex.
3. Sidewalks are too narrow; and
4. Wide streets, traffic and turning movements discourage pedestrian use in the immediate area of Seminary and Beauregard.
5. During inclement weather neither biking nor walking are attractive options.

The “Bicycle Safe Route” from the Seminary is arguably not a safe route. Bicyclist must use the sidewalk, and there are areas near Hammond School where there is no curb break, requiring a bicyclist to dismount to cross a street or driveway. Biking in the area of I-395, even with a pedestrian ramp, is dangerous because of the merging action. If you use the pedestrian bridge to Southern Towers there are steps.

The on street-on sidewalk bicycle routes included in the Appendix are not routes normally taken by the few bicyclist brave enough to confront steep hills and traffic congestion. Since there are no attractive biking options, Appendix E is misleading.

Citizen concerns have not been addressed adequately

The community is concerned regarding the addition of 3,800 new vehicle trips and many more if you add shuttles and buses.

The community has expressed concerns regarding the free parking provided to employees, making it less attractive and less likely employees will take public or private transit.

Nearby residents are dissatisfied that appropriate measures are being taken to ensure employees and contractors will not be parking in neighborhood areas.

Residents have also expressed concern regarding impacts on fire and emergency medical service.

Proposals for bikes, walkway and paths, safe pedestrian crossings give a false impression. This is not a pedestrian-bike friendly area.

Residents remain skeptical the Transportation Management Plan will effectively mitigate traffic and transit impacts.

Virginia Railway Express

It is anticipated that 23%, 1474 employees, will be using the Virginia Railway Express (VRE) to get to and from work. The analysis only includes the VRE station at the King Street Metro station. The TMP fails to analyze the potential impact of this increase on VRE service, the Metro station, and public and shuttle service to the WHS-BRAC Office Complex at Mark Center.

There are 5,069 parking spaces at the Springfield-Franconia Metro/VRE station. This is a potential site for shuttling employees using the I-395 corridor.

Suggested Fixes

The proposed Transportation Plan should directly address the traffic congestion issue. The increased impacts and cost on the City of Alexandria taxpayers and nearby residents should be borne by the Department of Defense. The DoD should place a high priority on safe, efficient transportation of their employees to the WHS-BRAC-133 Office Complex at Mark Center with no adverse impacts on existing levels of traffic and transit service, or environmental quality.

The TMP should be phased-in, with a percentage of employees parking at satellite parking facilities and brought to the WHS-BRAC-133 Complex by public transit or shuttle. This would require the DoD to rent space at vacant commercial sites for temporary parking until transit, road improvements, employees enrolled and elements of the Transportation Management Plan are fully implemented. Full use of the parking facilities at the WHS-BRAC should begin once objectives of the TMP and transit goals are met.

DONALD N. BUCH

1. Preface/General:

- 1.1. Who is the intended "customer" of the TMP document? To what extent is it meant (essentially solely?) for WHS and to what extent is it intended or meant to inform the public? or the City? or NCPC? or who else?
 - 1.1.1. What is our City's response? Can we see the City's comments?
- 1.2. Given 1.1, it is difficult to know how much to say, question, ask. To the extent the public may not understand some of the methodology or conclusions, how much of an education are we due?
- 1.3. It would be helpful if all site plans, maps, road diagrams, etc. were oriented in the same direction, preferably with north at the top of the page, as we are generally accustomed to seeing.

2. Executive Summary:

- 2.1. (Page ES-1) Where would one find the "guidelines and standards" set forth by the NCPC, GSA and MWCOG?
- 2.2. (ES-1) How were the TMP goals established?
 - 2.2.1. Is there a commonly accepted way to assess how reasonable/aggressive they are or aren't?
- 2.3. (ES-2) To what degree was "expected mode choice" of personnel solicited and analyzed? We had previously understood this information was not being requested.
- 2.4. (ES-2) The noted expected "mode splits" total 100% so apparently this list does not include multiple modes but rather is a tabulation of the (final) mode people will use to actually arrive at the BRAC site. However, 23% of the personnel (1,474 people) are projected to reach "the BRAC-133 site" via rail - but rail does not serve the site?
- 2.5. (ES-2) "The proposed DOD shuttle(s)...from key Metrorail stations...is (are) expected to serve...a total of 2,970 commuters during the peak period..." But the preceding table indicated only 1,474 people in total would make use of (Metro)rail.
- 2.6. (ES-3) When personnel are presented with so many roadway options/alternatives how does one meaningfully distribute "generated trips...along the existing roadway network...as per the home zip code distribution"?
- 2.7. (ES-3) "A direct HOV access ramp plan from I-395 to Mark Center is also currently being evaluated by VDOT." I am assuming this is a reference to the long-discussed "direct access" into Mark Center as opposed to "Alternatives F and G" which are currently on the table but which feed into Seminary Road. So, with respect to "direct access", as I understand the use of the term on page ES-3, we have repeatedly been told that this option is no longer under consideration and is not a possibility.

- 2.8. (ES-3) Will the commuting needs of personnel at IDA and CNA and/or others in the vicinity be considered in any manner?

3. Section 1 - Introduction:

- 3.1. (page 1) While the TMP for the previous site was "approved" in 2003:
- 3.1.1. It was acknowledged to be incomplete;
 - 3.1.2. It required that personnel pay market rates for parking;
 - 3.1.3. The direct I-395 access was later waived with no commensurate reduction in the gross square footage permitted to be developed (a question for the City, rather than DOD, to answer).
- 3.2. (3) Perhaps it's only semantics but I would suggest that the TMP goal is to achieve (not "strive for") not more than "X %" of personnel using SOVs to access the site (as opposed to "a 40 per cent reduction [*from what?*] of SOV trips to the BRAC-133 site").
- 3.3. (4) This section indicates there are 3,747 parking spaces (per page 41: 2,032 in the north garage and 1,715 in the south). We have repeatedly been told there are 1,854 spaces in the south garage and 2,044 in the north garage (for a total of 3,898 spaces) - is this incorrect?

4. Section 2 - Employee Relocation and Travel Characteristics:

- 4.1. (8) From a layman's perspective it seems strange not to at least try to survey all personnel, including those of the contractors (being 31% of the total site population). Given the severity of the transportation challenges and the seeming need to address the task on an almost individual-by-individual basis, why would one not want to, at a minimum, collect all zip codes rather than "interpolate" where 2,000 might live. Is there more to this than meets the eye?
- 4.2. (8) Given the noted density of personnel along the I-95/I-395 corridor (also see page 11 for reference to this), why would one not consider shuttle service from the Franconia/Springfield station which is not only served by VRE and Metrorail but where there are 5,069 park and ride spaces (occupancy rate not provided - see page 43)?
- 4.3. (9) Again, it seems that focus was placed on how employees currently get to work and the "commute patterns" they currently use. Why would focus not be placed primarily on employees' future expectations, especially given that (a) rail, currently used by many, will no longer be an option to reach their final destination and (b) whereas rail is confined to specific routes, travel by road offers innumerable possibilities to most commuters and it is precisely the traffic conditions on those roads (and resultant route choices) that one is attempting to address?
- 4.4. (10) It would be helpful to see some figures with major roadways clearly overlaid on the employee distribution.
- 4.5. (11) It is interesting to note that "over 45 per cent of employees use some form of transit today", but two thirds of those use Metrorail for at least part of their trip - presumably on their final leg going to their office - and now none of those 1,956 people (30.53% Metrorail users of 6,409 total personnel) will have that option.

- 4.6. (14) Again, are the "anticipated mode choices" based upon future preferences as stated by surveyed personnel or were the numbers projected based upon current mode choices?
- 4.7. (15) If someone "slugs" or transports others to somewhere other than BRAC-133 and arrives at BRAC as an SOV, do they get "credit" for being an HOV? If they leave BRAC empty with the intention of picking up "sluggers" even on the Mark Center site, how does that get substantiated or how do they get credit for it?
 - 4.7.1. Presumably many SOVs will pick up riders from local Metro stations in order to qualify for an HOV parking space, while reducing the need for shuttle service.
- 4.8. (16) Are the shuttle frequencies a result of capacity/convenience/financial practicality or are they based solely upon projected demand?
- 4.9. (16) What do the shuttles do during off-peak hours? Does the extent of their off-peak utility impact the extent of the available shuttles at peak hours (i.e. limit the number of vehicles WHS would be prepared to purchase)?
- 4.10. (16) Have the costs of the shuttle service(s) been calculated? Is there a point at which this would constrain WHS' ability to offer all the services desired/required?
 - 4.10.1. Is there a point at which Alexandria will or could be expected to shoulder some of the costs?
 - 4.10.2. To what extent has maximizing/optimizing the use of the existing DASH bus system been considered?
- 4.11. (16) Is there a contemplated seasonality to walking/biking?
- 4.12. (17) "...with 10 percent to 30 percent of employees riding Metrorail today, it is implicit that employees are accustomed to transit." Per page 11, 30.53% currently use Metro. One assumes convenience is a/the primary factor, given that most relocating personnel currently work at locations adjacent to Metrorail stations. Whatever their motivation, it will no longer be an option (at least as their final leg to reach their office).
- 4.13. (17) The tabulation in section 2.3.2 ("mode choice splits") totals 100%. One then assumes that the focus of these projections is (for those that make use of more than one mode) the final mode used to arrive at BRAC-133 site?
- 4.14. (18) Is it realistic that 90% of the entire 6,409-person workforce (5,768 people) will commonly be on site at the same time?
 - 4.14.1. Over and above days off, vacation, travel, etc., one might hope that a genuine focus on things such as flextime, variable work schedules, working from home and the like would result in a "peak load" that results in considerably more than an estimated 640 personnel being "off site" (or at least off the roadways) at the hours recognized as being the most traffic-sensitive.
 - 4.14.2. To what extent can DOD influence (or dictate?) relevant contractor behavior with respect to such things as noted in 4.14.1?
- 4.15. (18) Given the calculations of page 18, at the "90% level" there will be 34 "available" (vacant) parking spaces.
 - 4.15.1. A significant portion of those will likely be "disabled spaces" (based upon 48 being provided [per page 41] and the perception that it is very uncommon to have full utilization of disabled spaces) so perhaps there are a net 20 (non-

- disabled) spaces available. Spread over 8 floors in two separate (and access-controlled) buildings, how easy will it be for someone to find one of those empty spaces anytime during a "90% occupancy" period?
- 4.15.2. Later in the report [see pages 105-106] it is indicated that all parking spaces will be pre-assigned. What then becomes of the 34 "available" (unused) spaces as calculated in Table 2-4 (page 18)?
- 4.16. (18) It appears the assumption has been made that anyone carpooling, vanpooling or slugging will do so in a vehicle that will subsequently be parked at BRAC. Is that realistic? To the extent it might be overly conservative, that would obviously free up some additional parking spaces.

5. Section 3 - Site Conditions:

- 5.1. (19) For the record, the City of Alexandria did not master-plan this site "for a development of this size and character":
- 5.1.1. the buildings are as much as 95 feet taller than the SUP called for (245 feet vs. 150 feet);
- 5.1.2. the total footprint covers 77% more area than the SUP called for (210,200 sq. ft. vs. 118,850 sq. ft.);
- 5.1.3. the gross square footage of the buildings is 30% more than the SUP called for (1,800,000 sq. ft. vs. 1,382,730 sq. ft.);
- 5.1.4. with respect to "character" I don't believe the City ever contemplated a major terrorist target, complete with a RIF.
- 5.2. (22) The Seminary Road/Mark Center Drive intersection is west (or northwest) of the site, not east of it.
- 5.3. (22) It would seem relevant to note that the "southbound auxiliary lane" of I-395 does not, in fact, extend entirely from King to Duke but merges to the left just before the exit ramp to eastbound Duke (and ramp from Duke to southbound I-395) causing major traffic issues.
- 5.4. (23) "Only the westbound Seminary Road traffic can legally execute left turns at Mark Center Drive" - to do so (and be in the correct lane) vehicles must have already been on Seminary to the east of I-395; vehicles which exited I-395 at Seminary cannot/will not be able to do that.
- 5.5. (24) Item 4 - "...site access (to Mark Center Drive) will be allowed for eastbound Seminary Road traffic only." Also for vehicles southbound out of Southern Towers, correct?
- 5.5.1. And what might that infer about future traffic (westbound on Seminary) choosing to enter Southern Towers only to make a u-turn in order to access Mark Center?
- 5.6. (27) For sake of information (and to address the peace of mind of local residents) does a vehicle that "fail(s) the scan" at the RIF get nothing more than an "escort to exit the site"?
- 5.7. (30) If the south garage has 1,715 spaces (see page 41) that would represent 45.8% of the 3,747 total available. If the peak hour traffic has 2,022 arriving vehicles (see page ES-3) and 45.8% of them go to the south garage, that is 926 vehicles. Yet, per page

30, that garage can serve "a maximum of 700 vehicles during the highest peak hour of demand".

- 5.7.1. Is it intended that arriving vehicles be distributed differently (between the two garages) at different times of the day?
- 5.8. (30) How is it determined which vehicles use which garage?
- 5.9. (35-36) One gets the sense that transit providers are largely going to wait and see what happens, then determine their response. It also sounds as though WHS is, to some degree, planning (or being advised) to do the same. Will there, in fact, be a very pro-active approach to assessing the very specific needs and desires of individual personnel and attempting (in advance of opening) to marry those with transit providers?
 - 5.9.1. From my personal (layman's) perspective, the ridematching software referenced on page 111 could be a major key to successfully doing this.
- 5.10. (37) How were five bus bays determined? Without having made any attempt to reconcile the various modes and providers of transportation, one senses this may well be insufficient.
 - 5.10.1. Will all bays be the same size?
- 5.11. (37) Will WHS be exclusively responsible for maintaining the Transportation Center? Is it anticipated that any portion of the expense will be borne by Alexandria?
- 5.12. (39) Is there the potential to, at some point, consolidate what will now be four different shuttle providers (Duke, CNA, IDA, WHS), which would presumably result in a variety of efficiencies?
 - 5.12.1. To what degree might economies of scale be realized by expanding the existing DASH bus system rather than establishing numerous new routes (and adding numerous new busses?) to the DOD shuttle system?
- 5.13. (39) What does it mean to have "capacity to support a 20 to 40 percent mode split"?
- 5.14. (42) "As the building is LEED Gold certified..." It is? - 15 months before completion?
- 5.15. (42) To the extent that all parking spaces are apparently pre-allocated how can "carpool/vanpool parking...not be capped"?
- 5.16. (42) To what extent have shuttles from park and ride lots been explored?
- 5.17. (43) It would be helpful to know the percentage utilization of the WMATA park and ride facilities noted on page 43, as has been done in Appendix D for many other facilities.

6. Section 4 - Traffic Impact Analysis:

- 6.1. General Comment: To the extent that it is our tax dollars which have been used to pay for the bulk of the recent traffic studies, it is extremely disconcerting to see that the TMP lists no fewer than 12 of them with Benham's/SAIC's now representing number 13!
- 6.2. (58) For benefit of our continuing education - why were the Wells and the VHB studies selected to be used as the basis for SAIC's projections?
 - 6.2.1. Does the Alexandria city administration agree with this decision?

- 6.3. (62) Table 4-2 At the 90% employee attendance rate (see page 18), there are 9 visitor vehicles arriving from 5-6 am; 45 from 6-7 am; 67 from 7-8 am; 42 from 8-9 am and 9 from 9-10 am. But there are only 67 visitor spaces to begin with.
- 6.4. (63) Table 4-3 A similar question here. 64 visitors depart (from 67 visitor spaces) between 4 and 5 pm. Where then have the 48 that depart between 5 and 6 pm been parking?
- 6.5. (64) "...most of the trips originating from north and south directions will travel along I-395 and access the site at Seminary Road interchange."
- 6.5.1. What are the definitions of "north" and "south"?
- 6.5.2. While a major desire is to promote use of HOVs, the HOV lanes of I-395 don't offer the possibility of "accessing" the Seminary Road interchange.
- 6.5.3. Given the current state of traffic on I-395 and the expectation that it will only get worse, some would suggest that I-395 is one of their least attractive options and may well not be the route chosen by "most" commuters.
- 6.6. (65) One takes I-395 southbound (not "northbound") to reach Mark Center from the Pentagon.
- 6.7. The extent of the projected congestion is extremely concerning:
- 6.7.1. (73) "...many of the lane group movements and intersection approaches operate at unacceptable LOS for the 2011 baseline condition. These degrading operations at the individual approaches will eventually lead to the failure of the overall intersection(s)."
- 6.7.2. (85) "...without BRAC improvements..." (that term appearing to be generally undefined) "some of the I-395 mainline and ramp sections (are already)...operating at unacceptable LOS."
- 6.7.3. (85) "...all the (Seminary/Beauregard) intersection approaches and lane group movements experiencing severe delay."
- 6.7.4. (89) "...locations of concern throughout the study area...long traffic queues and spillovers...unacceptable E or F, with demand exceeding capacity."
- 6.7.5. (89) "...spillback along southbound I-395 extends north past the King Street interchange..." with the implication that the Duke Street interchange will experience the same thing.
- 6.8. (90-92) Unfortunately the TMP does not appear to include any assessment of anticipated traffic conditions after the "solutions" (a term used in the Section 4.4.9 heading but which one might logically fear is a rather gross overstatement) are implemented. It is further noted that some of the proposed mitigation measures are "long-term" and will require "extensive coordination".
- 6.8.1. **One is left with the very real sense that there are simply no materially significant traffic mitigation measures which can be implemented anytime in the foreseeable future. The question then becomes "What do we do?" Will we be compelled to live with "failure", "severe delay", multi-mile "spillbacks" impacting multiple interchanges? Will we be forced to accept the "unacceptable E or F" levels of service? What are our options? Have we any?**

- 6.9. (90) It appears that Foster Avenue is proposed to be converted into a major connector from Beauregard to Seminary. Is that correct? I believe this is the first time the community has been advised of this? Have the residents of Foster been consulted?
- 6.10. (93) It is disappointing to note that WHS employees were apparently surveyed about their concerns but without having had any briefing and with their specifically noting a "lack of information". Are they not the key source of "input data" in addressing future transportation needs?
- 6.11. (94) Point 3 "These improvements (as proposed in the TMP) if approved and implemented will alleviate traffic congestion and promote smooth travel." The term "alleviate" is undefined but the implied conclusion does not seem to align with earlier assertions about insolvable "failures" and anything but "smooth travel".
- 6.12. (94) Point 4 "...direct HOV access from I-395 South to Seminary Road...will relieve I-395 congestion..." (the term "relieve" being undefined). That is not my understanding - it might lessen congestion somewhat but this implication would seem to materially overstate expectations.

7. Section 5 - Travel Demand Management:

- 7.1. (105-106) It would be helpful to have further elaboration about the assignment of parking spaces. Apparently there will be no more than one permit per space (page 105) and it "...will be numbered, corresponding to a single employee's registered vehicle..." (page 106).
 - 7.1.1. Does that then indicate that no space will typically be used for more than 8 hours per day, sitting unused for the remaining 16 hours?
 - 7.1.2. Will the space assigned to someone working 5 (or 4) days a week then sit totally unused for the other 2 or 3 days a week?
 - 7.1.3. One assumes peak occupancy will generally be from, say, 7 am to 6 pm Mondays through Fridays. If someone (whose vehicle is not among the chosen parking permit holders) works an appreciably different shift and/or on Saturday or Sunday are they unable to access garages which are presumably 80% or more vacant?
- 7.2. (111) "Purchasing a licensing agreement to ridematching software and/or online applications..." (Or developing WHS/DOD's own software?) To me, this is the best course of action with respect to addressing personnel needs and attempting to respond to them. Travel patterns are very personalized and options clearly extend far beyond printed transportation schedules, etc. The best option for any individual may well be just around the block or down the street. WHS needs to facilitate not only "matching" personnel having similar needs but to work, virtually individual by individual, to see what "tweaks" can be made, services added, schedules altered, etc. in order to convert "doesn't meet my needs" to "I can do that".
 - 7.2.1. Hopefully it would not be confined just to matching two automobile commuters but to all modes of transportation so, for example, bus companies could be made aware of opportunities to provide additional and valued services.
 - 7.2.2. Contract personnel ought to be included.

- 7.2.3. At some point economies of scale could doubtless be realized by including IDA, CNA, Duke and possibly others in the program.

8. Other:

- 8.1. To what extent has the timeline been given detailed attention?
 - 8.1.1. As but one example - I would assume that there are lengthy lead times in ordering, or even leasing, things like shuttle busses (and, if needed, more DASH busses).
- 8.2. To the extent that initial goals are not achieved within a reasonable timeframe, what happens?
- 8.3. What is the plan if Representative Moran's "amendment" gets passed?
- 8.4. To what extent have the potential (traffic) ramifications of things such as the Beauregard Corridor Plan and the redevelopment of Landmark Mall and the Plaza at Landmark been considered?
- 8.5. To what extent have cost ramifications been considered?
 - 8.5.1. Is there a potential that good ideas will not be pursued purely because of the economic consequences?
- 8.6. Has responsibility for the provision of emergency services been resolved?
 - 8.6.1. Access issues addressed?
 - 8.6.2. Who is paying for what?
- 8.7. Have evacuation plans been made to address any possible emergency, attack or "event"?
 - 8.7.1. If there are "problems" in the RIF, what procedures are to be followed?
- 8.8. Has the City of Alexandria made any assessment of the cost ramifications to the City of what is or is not contemplated in the TMP?
 - 8.8.1. Again, as but one example, how many more DASH busses might be needed? What's the lead time? How will/would they be paid for?
- 8.9. Does WHS have any role in enforcing "local" area parking restrictions?
 - 8.9.1. Would they assist local law enforcement in determining if a vehicle belonged to a BRAC employee?

OWEN CURTIS

Let me start my comments by thanking Dave Dexter, Dave Cavanaugh, and Don Buch for the thoroughness of their comments. I did not see a comment in their with which I disagreed. Thanks for taking the time to get into the details on this document, which at 190+ pages is a bit long. Please pardon any of my comments below if they are duplicative of what has already been noted by these and other reviewers.

I was not all that pleased with the document. On the one hand, there are things which are mentioned which I believe hold real promise for decreasing the impacts of BRAC 133, such as the significant DOD shuttle program from a variety of Metrorail stations. But the TMP does not (unless I missed it) really get into what needs to be done to make sure that WHS staff actually use these shuttles. I do not want to be paying federal taxes for such shuttles if they are not highly subscribed and if they do not significantly mitigate the traffic impacts of BRAC 133.

On the other hand, the document (as others have pointed out) does not get into the issue of paid parking. Simply put, many (if not most) of the WHS staff who will be moved to Mark Center are already paying for parking, chiefly market pricing. Does anyone really think that not charging them will help them shift to a non-drive alone mode????

I have spent my career writing reports on transportation issues, so I appreciate the effort by the consultant staff who prepared this report. But I do believe they need to go back and clarify for us, for their client, and for the world a number of things which are presented in this report in a manner which really is reporting them to insiders, not to the public. A few of the key points which need major clarification are:

What is the baseline for the TMP goals of a "40% reduction in single occupancy vehicle trips?" The TMP should state very clearly what the end state is that must be achieved. The Army, Duke, the City, et al heretofore have led us all to believe that the TMP was to get to a 40% non-single occupancy mode share, which is not the same thing as a 40% reduction in SOV vehicle trips. The TMP goals need to be articulated so clearly that a 5th grader can understand them, e.g., no more than x% of total employee and visitor trips to the site will be by SOV.

I strenuously object to the goal as being to "encourage alternate commuter modes ...". That is a good intention, but the Road to Hell is paved with such things. The goal is to achieve (not encourage) major (or significant

or substantial) diversion of commuter trips to ridesharing, transit, walking, and bicycle. And then this document is supposed to enumerate all the things which are incumbent on WHS, other parts of the Army, Duke, etc., to make sure -- absolutely and unequivocally -- that such diversion occur. And then to test to prove they are happening, and to revise and implement a stronger plan if they are not.

The goal to establish a TMP office is not a goal at all. It is a statement of what must be done, but if the goals of a TMP are that soft (and unrelated to the outcome of traffic and trip levels and characteristics), then it really isn't a TMP at all.

I am troubled by the lack of clear definition on p. ES-2 where the mode splits are listed as "anticipated.". Are these anticipated with the TMP in full implementation? at opening day of BRAC 133? Or are these the baseline without the TMP in place? Here is what the TMP needs to state, something like this:

If BRAC is implemented and nothing else is done, here are the anticipated mode shares, and the traffic impacts of same.

Here is a plan to make those impacts less, and achieve the goals.

If the plan is implemented, then the resultant, improved mode shares would be as follows, and they do or do not meet the goals set for this project.

I did not see information in this report which focused on any other than the AM or PM peak hour. Hell, we all know that the traffic stinks in this area for way longer than an hour. Why does this report not address that point? When I did the EIS for the relocation of all Naval Systems Command staff from Crystal City to one of five sites (including Mark Center) back in 1990, we specifically addressed the duration during which TMP efforts might mitigate those impacts. [By the way, we concluded what the City, the Army, and all their consultants failed to conclude this time -- that there was no way in hell that Mark Center offered a reasonable location to place DOD personnel, due to the lack of a Metro station.]

I could go on, but the others have covered most/all of the other points which I would have made. I am most curious as to the process from here on out, and most curious as to how aggressive the City will be in jawboning the Army to prove that it is achieving the target level of traffic reduction before completing the full opening of the facility.

KATHY M. BURNS

Plan lacks necessary details on costs and sources of funding for proposed TMP improvement. The state is not a likely source for increased funding nor is the City and this is worrisome since changes will take a lot of money.

Also of concern is that the people drafting this plan may not have actually gone to the site----or they would have realized the inaccuracies with Foster Street.